

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Patent Application

5 Applicant(s): Basson et al.
Docket No.: YOR920000840US1
Serial No.: 09/822,703
Filing Date: March 30, 2001
Group: 2145
10 Examiner: Adnan M. Mirza

Title: Prioritization of Networks for Preferred Groups

15

APPEAL BRIEF

Mail Stop Appeal Brief - Patents
Commissioner for Patents
20 P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

25 Appellants hereby appeal the final rejection dated March 20, 2007, of
claims 1-50 of the above-identified patent application.

REAL PARTY IN INTEREST

The present application is assigned to International Business Machines
30 Corporation, as evidenced by an assignment recorded on March 30, 2001 in the United
States Patent and Trademark Office at Reel 011681, Frame 0156. The assignee,
International Business Machines Corporation, is the real party in interest.

RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

35 There are no related appeals or interferences.

STATUS OF CLAIMS

Claims 1-50 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable
over Anderson (United States Patent Application Publication Number 2001/0025301) and

further in view of Schuster et al. (United States Patent Number 6,584,490). Claims 1-5, 7-9, 12-14, 16, 17, 19, 21-25, 27-29, 31, 32, 34, 36-40, 42-44, 46, 47, and 49 are being appealed.

5

STATUS OF AMENDMENTS

There have been no amendments filed subsequent to the final rejection.

SUMMARY OF CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER

Independent claim 1 is directed to a method for prioritization of a network
10 160 for one or more preferred groups (page 4, lines 1-23), the method comprising the steps of: a) determining if network information is assigned to one or more preferred groups (page 5, lines 15-17); and b) configuring a network 160 to assign a higher priority to the network information when the network information is assigned to one or more preferred groups, the higher priority being relative to network information not assigned to
15 one or more preferred groups (page 5, line 15, to page 6, line 1).

Claims 2, 22, and 37 are directed to marking the network information assigned to one or more of the preferred groups with a label, the label indicating that the network information is assigned to a preferred group (page 4, lines 1-23; page 5, lines 15-17; and page 14, lines 19-24).

20 Claims 3, 23, and 38 are directed to a step of receiving the network information; wherein step (a) further comprises the step of determining that the network information assigned to one or more of the preferred groups comprises the label (page 4, lines 1-23; page 5, line 15, to page 6, line 1); and wherein step (b) further comprises the step of transmitting the network information assigned to one or more of the preferred
25 groups before previously received network information is sent, the previously received network information not assigned to one or more of the preferred groups (page 17, line 22, to page 18, line 18).

Claim 4 is directed to receiving the network information; wherein step (a) further comprises the step of determining that the network information assigned to one or
30 more of the preferred groups comprises the label (page 4, lines 1-23; page 5, line 15, to

page 6, line 1); and wherein step (b) further comprises the step of assigning priority of information within a queue, wherein the queue comprises additional network information that does not have the label and that was received before the network information having the label, and wherein the network information having the label is assigned higher
5 priority than the additional network information (page 6, lines 1-11; page 17, line 22, to page 18, line 18).

Claim 5 is directed to the step of transmitting, based on the priority, the network information having the label before the additional network information, which does not have the label, is transmitted (page 6, lines 1-11; page 17, line 22, to page 18,
10 line 18).

Claims 7, 24, and 39 are directed to the steps of: determining if the network information assigned to one or more of the preferred groups is being routed to or from an application 127 running on a server 120; and increasing resources of the application 127 when the application 127 is running on a server 120 and when the
15 network information assigned to one or more of the preferred groups is assigned to a preferred group (page 20, lines 6-16).

Claims 8, 25, and 40 are directed to the steps of: identifying a user; determining if a user belongs to a preferred group; and assigning network information to a preferred group when the user belongs to a preferred group (page 15, line 26, to page
20 16, line 12).

Claim 9 is directed to the step of determining, when the user does belong to a preferred group, if the user is using an application 127 for a preferred purpose; and wherein the step of assigning network information to a preferred group when the user belongs to a preferred group further comprises the step of assigning network information
25 to a preferred group when the user belongs to the preferred group and when the user is using an application 127 for a preferred purpose (page 15, line 26, to page 16, line 12; page 20, lines 6-16).

Claims 12, 27, and 42 are directed to the steps of: determining, at a firewall 230, if an application 127 is to be blocked; and blocking network information
30 from or to the application 127 unless the network information is assigned to a preferred

group (page 12, line 26, to page 13, line 23).

Claims 13, 28, and 43 are directed to the steps of: comparing 310 input biometric data from an individual with stored biometric data in a database 330; determining if the input biometric data matches the stored biometric data; and
5 determining that the network information belongs to a preferred group when the input biometric data matches the stored biometric data (page 13, line 24, to page 14, line 7).

Independent claim 14 is directed to a method for prioritization of networks for preferred groups, the method comprising the steps of: requesting a prioritization privilege of an individual; determining, by accessing a database 330, the prioritization
10 privilege of the individual (page 13, line 24, to page 14, line 21); and configuring a network 160 to assign a higher priority to network information assigned to the individual when the prioritization privilege indicates that the network information belongs to a preferred group (page 5, line 15, to page 6, line 1).

Claims 16, 31, and 46 are directed to marking the network information
15 with a label, which indicates that the network information belongs to a preferred group, when the prioritization privilege indicates that the network information belongs to a preferred group (page 4, lines 1-23; page 13, line 24, to page 14, line 21).

Independent claim 17 is directed to a method for prioritization of a network 160 for one or more preferred groups, the method comprising the steps of:
20 determining if an individual belongs to one or more preferred groups; marking network information associated with the individual with a priority label (page 13, line 24, to page 14, line 21); and configuring a network 160 to assign a higher priority, as compared to network information not marked with a priority label, to the marked network information (page 5, line 15, to page 6, line 1).

25 Claims 19, 34, and 49 are directed to the step of determining if an individual belongs to one or more preferred groups comprises the steps of: determining if the individual exists in a database 330 that comprises the one or more preferred groups; determining a priority privilege of the individual when the individual exists in the database 330 (page 13, line 24, to page 14, line 21); and determining, when the individual
30 exists in the database 330, if the priority privilege indicates that network information

associated with the individual is to be prioritized (page 13, line 24, to page 14, line 21).

Independent claim 21 is directed to a system for prioritization of a network 160 for one or more preferred groups, the system comprising: a memory 630 that stores computer-readable code; and a processor 620 operatively coupled to the memory 630, the processor 620 configured to implement the computer-readable code, the computer-readable code configured to: a) determine if network information is assigned to one or more preferred groups (page 5, lines 15-17); and b) configure a network 160 to assign a higher priority to the network information when the network information is assigned to one or more preferred groups, the higher priority being relative to network information not assigned to one or more preferred groups (page 5, line 15, to page 6, line 1).

Independent claim 29 is directed to a system for prioritization of a network 160 for one or more preferred groups, the system comprising: a memory 630 that stores computer-readable code; and a processor 620 operatively coupled to the memory 630, the processor 620 configured to implement the computer-readable code, the computer-readable code configured to: request a prioritization privilege of an individual; determine, by accessing a database 330, the prioritization privilege of the individual (page 13, line 24, to page 14, line 21); and configure a network 160 to assign a higher priority to network information assigned to the individual when the prioritization privilege indicates that the network information belongs to a preferred group (page 5, line 15, to page 6, line 1).

Independent claim 32 is directed to a system for prioritization of a network 160 for one or more preferred groups, the system comprising: a memory 630 that stores computer-readable code; and a processor 620 operatively coupled to the memory 630, the processor 620 configured to implement the computer-readable code, the computer-readable code configured to: determine if an individual belongs to one or more preferred groups; mark network information associated with the individual with a priority label (page 13, line 24, to page 14, line 21); and configure a network 160 to assign a higher priority, as compared to network information not marked with a priority label, to the marked network information (page 5, line 15, to page 6, line 1).

Independent claim 36 is directed to an article of manufacture comprising:
a computer-readable medium having computer-readable code means embodied thereon,
the computer-readable code means comprising: a) a step to determine if network
information is assigned to one or more preferred groups (page 5, lines 15-17); and b) a
5 step to configure a network 160 to assign a higher priority to the network information
when the network information is assigned to one or more preferred groups, the higher
priority being relative to network information not assigned to one or more preferred
groups (page 5, line 15, to page 6, line 1)

Independent claim 44 is directed to an article of manufacture comprising:
10 a computer-readable medium having computer-readable code means embodied thereon,
the computer-readable code means comprising: a step to request a prioritization privilege
of an individual; determine, by accessing a database 330, the prioritization privilege of
the individual (page 13, line 24, to page 14, line 21); and configure a network 160 to
assign a higher priority to network information assigned to the individual when the
15 prioritization privilege indicates that the network information belongs to a preferred
group (page 5, line 15, to page 6, line 1).

Independent claim 47 is directed to an article of manufacture comprising:
a computer-readable medium having computer-readable code means embodied thereon,
the computer-readable code means comprising: determine if an individual belongs to one
20 or more preferred groups; mark network information associated with the individual with a
priority label (page 13, line 24, to page 14, line 21); and configure a network 160 to
assign a higher priority, as compared to network information not marked with a priority
label, to the marked network information (page 5, line 15, to page 6, line 1).

25 STATEMENT OF GROUNDS OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL

Claims 1-50 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable
over Anderson and further in view of Schuster et al.

ARGUMENTIndependent Claims 1, 14, 17, 21, 29, 32, 36, 44 and 47

Independent claims 1, 14, 17, 21, 29, 32, 36, 44, and 47 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson and further in view of Schuster et al. Regarding claims 1, 21, and 36, the Examiner asserts that Anderson teaches a) determining if network information is assigned to one or more preferred groups; and b) configuring a network to assign a higher priority to the network information when the network information is assigned to one or more preferred groups (page 4, paragraphs 39 and 43). The Examiner acknowledges that Anderson did not disclose in detail the “higher priority being relative to network information not assigned to one or more preferred groups,” but asserts that Schuster discloses “a selected low priority level would block calls from certain individuals, which calls from other individuals may be deemed important enough to set a high enough priority level to interrupt the business meeting.” (Col. 8, lines 58-62.) The Examiner asserts that a person of ordinary skill in the art would have combined the cited references to “reduce latency by improving priority scheduling.”

Applicants note that, although Anderson teaches that a “method should preferably prioritize transmission according to the destination that is receiving the most important, i.e. time critical, information” (page 2, paragraph 14), the method taught by Anderson *only* requires that “destinations receiving data *from many sources* will receive *priority*.” (Page 4, paragraph 43; emphasis added.) Anderson claims that “this is effective because communication stations 30 that receive traffic from many locations have been shown to be more likely to be receiving more time-critical traffic, or *to have many users*. Communication stations 30 that receive data from only a few sources have been shown to be more likely transferring large amounts of data, for which some delay is acceptable.” (Page 18, paragraph 223; emphasis added.) Contrary to Anderson’s assertion, the number of sources from which data is received is *not* indicative of a time critical characteristic of the data, as would be apparent to a person of ordinary skill in the art. For example, regardless of the number of sources, video conferencing streams are *typically time critical*. Similarly, large text files are *typically not time critical*, regardless

of the number of sources.

In any case, Anderson does *not* disclose or suggest configuring a network to assign a higher priority to the network information when the network information is assigned to one or more *preferred groups*. The present disclosure teaches that “preferred
5 groups are those ***groups of individuals*** that are ***allowed to prioritize their communications*** over a network.” (Page 4, lines 11-12; emphasis added.) Anderson does *not* disclose or suggest that preferred groups are *groups of individuals*, and does *not* disclose or suggest that preferred groups are *allowed to prioritize their communications*

The Examiner also acknowledges that Anderson did not disclose in detail
10 that the “higher priority being relative to network information not assigned to one or more preferred groups,” but asserts that Schuster discloses “a selected low priority level would block calls from certain individuals, which calls from other individuals may be deemed important enough to set a high enough priority level to interrupt the business meeting.”

15 Applicants note that, as the Examiner acknowledges, the priority level disclosed by Schuster is utilized for determining *how received calls are handled* (blocked or allowed to interrupt a business meeting, etc.). Schuster teaches that,

20 in another embodiment, the user 220 may use the PID 210 *to configure the voice communication device 208 to screen calls* based on priority levels set for individuals for whom the user 220 has provided an entry in an address book.
(Col. 10, line 65, to col. 11, line 1; emphasis added.)

Thus, the call handling is *provided by the voice communication device 208*. Schuster also teaches that voice communication device 208 is attached to the
25 network (FIG. 2), but does ***not disclose or suggest that voice communication device 208 is an element of the network***. Thus, Schuster does *not* disclose or suggest that the priorities are utilized for ***configuring a network***, and does *not* disclose or suggest that the priorities are utilized for ***configuring a network to assign a higher priority to the network information*** when the network information is assigned to one or more *preferred*
30 *groups*, as would be apparent to a person of ordinary skill in the art.

In any case, contrary to the Examiner's assertion, a person of ordinary skill in the art would *not* have combined the cited references to "reduce latency by improving priority scheduling," since the priority disclosed by Schuster is *not* related to priority scheduling that effects network latency, as defined in the art. Independent claims 1, 21, and 36 require configuring a network to assign a higher priority to the network information when the network information is assigned to one or more preferred groups, independent claims 14, 29, and 44 require configuring a network to assign a higher priority to network information assigned to the individual when the prioritization privilege indicates that the network information belongs to a preferred group, and independent claims 17, 32, and 47 require determining if an individual belongs to one or more preferred groups; marking network information associated with the individual with a priority label; and configuring a network to assign a higher priority, as compared to network information not marked with a priority label, to the marked network information.

Thus, Anderson and Schuster, alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest configuring a network to assign a higher priority to the network information when the network information is assigned to one or more preferred groups, as required by independent claims 1, 21, and 36, do not disclose or suggest configuring a network to assign a higher priority to network information assigned to the individual when the prioritization privilege indicates that the network information belongs to a preferred group, as required by independent claims 14, 29, and 44, and do not disclose or suggest determining if an individual belongs to one or more preferred groups; marking network information associated with the individual with a priority label; and configuring a network to assign a higher priority, as compared to network information not marked with a priority label, to the marked network information, as required by independent claims 17, 32, and 47.

Claims 2, 22 and 37

The Examiner asserts that Anderson discloses the step of marking the network information assigned to one or more of the preferred groups with a label, the label indicating that the network information is assigned to a preferred group. Appellants could find *no* disclosure or suggestion of the step of *marking the network information*

assigned to one or more of the preferred groups with a label, the label indicating that the network information is assigned to a preferred group in Paragraph 0047 of Anderson.

Thus, Anderson and Schuster, alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest the step of marking the network information assigned to one or more of the preferred groups with a label, the label indicating that the network information is
5 assigned to a preferred group, as required by claims 2, 22 and 37.

Claims 3, 23 and 38

The Examiner asserts that Anderson discloses the step of transmitting the network information assigned to one or more of the preferred groups before previously
10 received network information is sent, the previously received network information not assigned to one or more of the preferred groups. Appellants could find *no* disclosure or suggestion of the step of *transmitting the network information assigned to one or more of the preferred groups before previously received network information is sent*, the previously received network information not assigned to one or more of the preferred
15 groups in Paragraph 0157 of Anderson.

Thus, Anderson and Schuster, alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest the step of transmitting the network information assigned to one or more of the preferred groups before previously received network information is sent, the previously received network information not assigned to one or more of the preferred groups, as
20 required by claims 3, 23, and 38.

Claim 4

The Examiner asserts that Anderson discloses the step of assigning priority of information within a queue, wherein the queue comprises additional network information that does not have the label and that was received before the network
25 information having the label, and wherein the network information having the label is assigned higher priority than the additional network information. Appellants could find *no* disclosure or suggestion of the step of assigning priority of information within a queue, *wherein the queue comprises additional network information that does not have the label and that was received before the network information having the label, and*
30 *wherein the network information having the label is assigned higher priority than the*

additional network information in Paragraph 0183 of Anderson.

Thus, Anderson and Schuster, alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest the step of assigning priority of information within a queue, wherein the queue comprises additional network information that does not have the label and that was received before the network information having the label, and wherein the network information having the label is assigned higher priority than the additional network information, as required by claim 4.

Claim 5

The Examiner asserts that Anderson discloses the step of transmitting, based on the priority, the network information having the label before the additional network information, which does not have the label, is transmitted. Appellants could find *no* disclosure or suggestion of the step of transmitting, *based on the priority*, the network information having the label before the additional network information, which does not have the label, is transmitted in Paragraph 0183 of Anderson.

Thus, Anderson and Schuster, alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest the step of transmitting, based on the priority, the network information having the label before the additional network information, which does not have the label, is transmitted, as required by claim 5.

Claims 7, 24 and 39

The Examiner asserts that Anderson discloses the steps of determining if the network information assigned to one or more of the preferred groups is being routed to or from an application running on a server; and increasing resources of the application when the application is running on a server and when the network information assigned to one or more of the preferred groups is assigned to a preferred group. Appellants could find *no* disclosure or suggestion of the steps of determining if the network information assigned to one or more of the preferred groups is being routed to or from an application running on a server; and *increasing resources of the application when the application is running on a server and when the network information assigned to one or more of the preferred groups is assigned to a preferred group* in Paragraphs 0226-0227 of Anderson.

Thus, Anderson and Schuster, alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest the steps of determining if the network information assigned to one or more of the preferred groups is being routed to or from an application running on a server; and increasing resources of the application when the application is running on a server and
5 when the network information assigned to one or more of the preferred groups is assigned to a preferred group, as required by claims 7, 24, and 39.

Claims 8, 25 and 40

The Examiner asserts that Anderson discloses assigning network information to a preferred group when the user belongs to a preferred group. Appellants
10 could find *no* disclosure or suggestion of *assigning network information to a preferred group when the user belongs to a preferred group* in Paragraph 0040 of Anderson.

Thus, Anderson and Schuster, alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest assigning network information to a preferred group when the user belongs to a preferred group, as required by claims 8, 25, and 40.

Claim 9

The Examiner asserts that Anderson discloses wherein the step of assigning network information to a preferred group when the user belongs to a preferred group further comprises the step of assigning network information to a preferred group when the user belongs to the preferred group and when the user is using an application
20 for a preferred purpose. Appellants could find *no* disclosure or suggestion of wherein the step of assigning network information to a preferred group when the user belongs to a preferred group further comprises the step of *assigning network information to a preferred group when the user belongs to the preferred group and when the user is using an application for a preferred purpose* in Paragraph 0237 of Anderson.

Thus, Anderson and Schuster, alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest wherein the step of assigning network information to a preferred group when the user belongs to a preferred group further comprises the step of assigning network information to a preferred group when the user belongs to the preferred group and when the user is using an application for a preferred purpose, as required by claim 9.
25

Claims 12, 27 and 42

The Examiner asserts that Anderson discloses the steps of determining, at a firewall, if an application is to be blocked; and blocking network information from or to the application unless the network information is assigned to a preferred group.

5 Appellants could find *no* disclosure or suggestion of the steps of determining, at a firewall, if an application is to be blocked; and *blocking network information from or to the application unless the network information is assigned to a preferred group* in Paragraph 0216 of Anderson.

Thus, Anderson and Schuster, alone or in combination, do not disclose or
10 suggest the steps of determining, at a firewall, if an application is to be blocked; and blocking network information from or to the application unless the network information is assigned to a preferred group, as required by claims 12, 27, and 42.

Claims 13, 28 and 43

The Examiner asserts that Anderson discloses determining that the
15 network information belongs to a preferred group when the input biometric data matches the stored biometric data. Appellants could find *no* disclosure or suggestion of *determining that the network information belongs to a preferred group when the input biometric data matches the stored biometric data* in Paragraph 0108 of Anderson.

Thus, Anderson and Schuster, alone or in combination, do not disclose or
20 suggest determining that the network information belongs to a preferred group when the input biometric data matches the stored biometric data, as required by claims 13, 28, and 43

Claims 16, 31 and 46

The Examiner asserts that Anderson discloses wherein the step of
25 configuring further comprises marking the network information with a label, which indicates that the network information belongs to a preferred group, when the prioritization privilege indicates that the network information belongs to a preferred group. Appellants could find *no* disclosure or suggestion of wherein the step of configuring further comprises *marking the network information with a label*, which
30 indicates that the network information belongs to a preferred group, when the

prioritization privilege indicates that the network information belongs to a preferred group in Paragraph 0235 of Anderson

5 Thus, Anderson and Schuster, alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest wherein the step of configuring further comprises marking the network information with a label, which indicates that the network information belongs to a preferred group, when the prioritization privilege indicates that the network information belongs to a preferred group, as required by claims 16, 31, and 46.

Claims 19, 34 and 49

10 The Examiner asserts that Anderson discloses determining, when the individual exists in the database, if the priority privilege indicates that network information associated with the individual is to be prioritized. Appellants could find *no* disclosure or suggestion of determining, *when the individual exists in the database, if the priority privilege indicates that network information associated with the individual is to be prioritized* in Paragraph 0040 of Anderson.

15 Thus, Anderson and Schuster, alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest determining, when the individual exists in the database, if the priority privilege indicates that network information associated with the individual is to be prioritized, as required by claims 19, 34, and 49.

20 Conclusion

The rejections of the cited claims under section 103 in view of Anderson and Schuster, alone or in combination, are therefore believed to be improper and should be withdrawn. The remaining rejected dependent claims are believed allowable for at least the reasons identified above with respect to the independent claims.

The attention of the Examiner and the Appeal Board to this matter is appreciated.

Respectfully,



Date: August 20, 2007

Kevin M. Mason
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 36,597
Ryan, Mason & Lewis, LLP
1300 Post Road, Suite 205
Fairfield, CT 06824
(203) 255-6560

APPENDIX

1. A method for prioritization of a network for one or more preferred groups, the method comprising the steps of:

5 a) determining if network information is assigned to one or more preferred groups; and

b) configuring a network to assign a higher priority to the network information when the network information is assigned to one or more preferred groups, the higher priority being relative to network information not assigned to one or more preferred groups.

10

2. The method of claim 1, wherein step (b) further comprises the step of marking the network information assigned to one or more of the preferred groups with a label, the label indicating that the network information is assigned to a preferred group.

15

3. The method of claim 2:

further comprising the step of receiving the network information;

wherein step (a) further comprises the step of determining that the network information assigned to one or more of the preferred groups comprises the label; and

20 wherein step (b) further comprises the step of transmitting the network information assigned to one or more of the preferred groups before previously received network information is sent, the previously received network information not assigned to one or more of the preferred groups.

25 4. The method of claim 2:

further comprising the step of receiving the network information;

wherein step (a) further comprises the step of determining that the network information assigned to one or more of the preferred groups comprises the label; and

30 wherein step (b) further comprises the step of assigning priority of information within a queue, wherein the queue comprises additional network information

that does not have the label and that was received before the network information having the label, and wherein the network information having the label is assigned higher priority than the additional network information.

5 5. The method of claim 4, wherein step (b) further comprises the step of transmitting, based on the priority, the network information having the label before the additional network information, which does not have the label, is transmitted.

6 The method of claim 2:
10 further comprising the step of receiving the network information;
 wherein step (a) further comprises the step of determining that the network information assigned to one or more of the preferred groups comprises the label; and
 wherein step (b) further comprises the steps of:
 determining if there is a fast path over which the network
15 information assigned to one or more of the preferred groups can be sent;
 and
 transmitting the network information assigned to one or more of the preferred groups over the fast path when there is a fast path.

20 7. The method of claim 1, wherein step (b) further comprises the steps of:
 determining if the network information assigned to one or more of the preferred groups is being routed to or from an application running on a server; and
 increasing resources of the application when the application is running on a server and when the network information assigned to one or more of the preferred
25 groups is assigned to a preferred group.

8. The method of claim 1, wherein step (a) further comprises the steps of:
 identifying a user;
 determining if a user belongs to a preferred group; and
30 assigning network information to a preferred group when the user belongs

to a preferred group.

9. The method of claim 8:

5 wherein step (a) further comprises the step of determining, when the user does belong to a preferred group, if the user is using an application for a preferred purpose; and

10 wherein the step of assigning network information to a preferred group when the user belongs to a preferred group further comprises the step of assigning network information to a preferred group when the user belongs to the preferred group and when the user is using an application for a preferred purpose.

10. The method of claim 8 wherein the step of assigning network information to a preferred group when the user belongs to a preferred group further comprises marking the network information with a label, indicating that the network information is
15 assigned to a preferred group, when the user belongs to a preferred group.

11. The method of claim 1, wherein the preferred groups comprise one or more of people with disabilities and medical professionals.

20 12. The method of claim 1, wherein step (b) further comprises the steps of: determining, at a firewall, if an application is to be blocked; and blocking network information from or to the application unless the network information is assigned to a preferred group.

25 13. The method of claim 1, wherein step (a) further comprises the steps of: comparing input biometric data from an individual with stored biometric data in a database;

determining if the input biometric data matches the stored biometric data;
and

30 determining that the network information belongs to a preferred group

when the input biometric data matches the stored biometric data.

14. A method for prioritization of networks for preferred groups, the method comprising the steps of:

5 requesting a prioritization privilege of an individual;
determining, by accessing a database, the prioritization privilege of the individual; and

configuring a network to assign a higher priority to network information assigned to the individual when the prioritization privilege indicates that the network
10 information belongs to a preferred group.

15 The method of claim 14, wherein the prioritization privilege comprises one or more of dates of use information, prioritization level information, and purpose information.

15

16. The method of claim 14, wherein the step of configuring further comprises marking the network information with a label, which indicates that the network information belongs to a preferred group, when the prioritization privilege indicates that the network information belongs to a preferred group.

20

17. A method for prioritization of a network for one or more preferred groups, the method comprising the steps of:

determining if an individual belongs to one or more preferred groups;
marking network information associated with the individual with a priority
25 label; and

configuring a network to assign a higher priority, as compared to network information not marked with a priority label, to the marked network information.

18. The method of claim 17, wherein the step of marking network information associated with the individual with a priority label comprises the step of marking network
30

information produced by an application the individual is using with a priority label.

19 The method of claim 17, wherein the step of determining if an individual belongs to one or more preferred groups comprises the steps of:

5 determining if the individual exists in a database that comprises the one or more preferred groups;

 determining a priority privilege of the individual when the individual exists in the database; and

 determining, when the individual exists in the database, if the priority
10 privilege indicates that network information associated with the individual is to be prioritized.

20 The method of claim 19, wherein the step of determining if an individual exists in a database that comprises the one or more preferred groups comprises the steps

15 of:

 determining if biometric data entered by the individual matches biometric data for a person in the database; and

 determining that the person is the individual and that the individual exists
in the database when the biometric data entered by the individual matches biometric data
20 for a person in the database.

21 A system for prioritization of a network for one or more preferred groups, the system comprising:

 a memory that stores computer-readable code; and

25 a processor operatively coupled to the memory, the processor configured to implement the computer-readable code, the computer-readable code configured to:

 a) determine if network information is assigned to one or more preferred groups; and

 b) configure a network to assign a higher priority to the network
30 information when the network information is assigned to one or more preferred groups,

the higher priority being relative to network information not assigned to one or more preferred groups.

22. The system of claim 21, wherein the computer-readable code is further configured, when performing step (b), to mark the network information assigned to one or more of the preferred groups with a label, the label indicating that the network information is assigned to a preferred group.

23. The system of claim 22:

wherein the computer-readable code is further configured to receive the network information;

wherein the computer-readable code is further configured, when performing step (a), to determine that the network information assigned to one or more of the preferred groups comprises the label; and

wherein the computer-readable code is further configured, when performing step (b), to transmit the network information assigned to one or more of the preferred groups before previously received network information is sent, the previously received network information not assigned to one or more of the preferred groups.

24. The system of claim 21, wherein the computer-readable code is further configured, when performing step (b), to:

determine if the network information assigned to one or more of the preferred groups is being routed to or from an application running on a server; and

increase resources of the application when the application is running on a server and when the network information assigned to one or more of the preferred groups is assigned to a preferred group.

25. The system of claim 21, wherein the computer-readable code is further configured, when performing step (a), to:

identify a user;

determine if a user belongs to a preferred group; and
assign network information to a preferred group when the user belongs to
a preferred group.

5 26. The system of claim 21, wherein the preferred groups comprise one or
more of people with disabilities and medical professionals.

27. The system of claim 21, wherein the computer-readable code is further
configured, when performing step (b), to:

10 determine, at a firewall, if an application is to be blocked; and
block network information from or to the application unless the network
information is assigned to a preferred group

28. The system of claim 21, wherein the computer-readable code is further
15 configured, when performing step (a), to:

compare input biometric data from an individual with stored biometric
data in a database;

determine if the input biometric data matches the stored biometric data;

and

20 determine that the network information belongs to a preferred group when
the input biometric data matches the stored biometric data.

29. A system for prioritization of a network for one or more preferred groups,
the system comprising:

25 a memory that stores computer-readable code; and
a processor operatively coupled to the memory, the processor configured
to implement the computer-readable code, the computer-readable code configured to:

request a prioritization privilege of an individual;

30 determine, by accessing a database, the prioritization privilege of the
individual; and

configure a network to assign a higher priority to network information assigned to the individual when the prioritization privilege indicates that the network information belongs to a preferred group.

5 30 The system of claim 29, wherein the prioritization privilege comprises one or more of dates of use information, prioritization level information, and purpose information

31 The system of claim 29, wherein the computer-readable code is further
10 configured, when configuring a network, to mark the network information with a label, which indicates that the network information belongs to a preferred group, when the prioritization privilege indicates that the network information belongs to a preferred group.

15 32 A system for prioritization of a network for one or more preferred groups, the system comprising:

 a memory that stores computer-readable code; and

 a processor operatively coupled to the memory, the processor configured to implement the computer-readable code, the computer-readable code configured to:

20 determine if an individual belongs to one or more preferred groups;

 mark network information associated with the individual with a priority label; and

 configure a network to assign a higher priority, as compared to network information not marked with a priority label, to the marked network information.

25

33 The system of claim 32, wherein the computer-readable code is further configured, when marking network information associated with the individual with a priority label, to mark network information produced by an application the individual is using with a priority label.

30

34. The system of claim 32, wherein the computer-readable code is further configured, when determining if an individual belongs to one or more preferred groups, to:

5 determine if the individual exists in a database that comprises the one or more preferred groups;

determine a priority privilege of the individual when the individual exists in the database; and

10 determine, when the individual exists in the database, if the priority privilege indicates that network information associated with the individual is to be prioritized.

35. The system of claim 34, wherein the computer-readable code is further configured, when determining if an individual exists in a database that comprises the one or more preferred groups, to:

15 determine if biometric data entered by the individual matches biometric data for a person in the database; and

determine that the person is the individual and that the individual exists in the database when the biometric data entered by the individual matches biometric data for a person in the database.

20

36. An article of manufacture comprising:

a computer-readable medium having computer-readable code means embodied thereon, the computer-readable code means comprising:

25 a) a step to determine if network information is assigned to one or more preferred groups; and

b) a step to configure a network to assign a higher priority to the network information when the network information is assigned to one or more preferred groups, the higher priority being relative to network information not assigned to one or more preferred groups.

30

37. The article of manufacture of claim 36, wherein the computer-readable code means further comprises, when performing step (b), a step to mark the network information assigned to one or more of the preferred groups with a label, the label indicating that the network information is assigned to a preferred group.

5

38. The article of manufacture of claim 36:

wherein the computer-readable code means further comprises a step to receive the network information;

10 wherein the computer-readable code means further comprises, when performing step (a), a step to determine that the network information assigned to one or more of the preferred groups comprises the label; and

15 wherein the computer-readable code means further comprises, when performing step (b), a step to transmit the network information assigned to one or more of the preferred groups before previously received network information is sent, the previously received network information not assigned to one or more of the preferred groups.

39. The article of manufacture of claim 36, wherein the computer-readable code means further comprises, when performing step (b):

20 a step to determine if the network information assigned to one or more of the preferred groups is being routed to or from an application running on a server; and

a step to increase resources of the application when the application is running on a server and when the network information assigned to one or more of the preferred groups is assigned to a preferred group.

25

40. The article of manufacture of claim 36, wherein the computer-readable code means further comprises, when performing step (a):

a step to identify a user;

a step to determine if a user belongs to a preferred group; and

30 assign network information to a preferred group when the user belongs to

a preferred group.

41. The article of manufacture of claim 36, wherein the preferred groups comprise one or more of people with disabilities and medical professionals.

5

42. The article of manufacture of claim 36, wherein the computer-readable code means further comprises, when performing step (b):

a step to determine, at a firewall, if an application is to be blocked; and

a step to block network information from or to the application unless the

10 network information is assigned to a preferred group.

43. The article of manufacture of claim 36, wherein the computer-readable code means further comprises, when performing step (a):

a step to compare input biometric data from an individual with stored

15 biometric data in a database;

a step to determine if the input biometric data matches the stored biometric data; and

a step to determine that the network information belongs to a preferred group when the input biometric data matches the stored biometric data.

20

44. An article of manufacture comprising:

a computer-readable medium having computer-readable code means embodied thereon, the computer-readable code means comprising:

a step to request a prioritization privilege of an individual;

25 determine, by accessing a database, the prioritization privilege of the individual; and

configure a network to assign a higher priority to network information assigned to the individual when the prioritization privilege indicates that the network information belongs to a preferred group.

30

45. The article of manufacture of claim 44, wherein the prioritization privilege comprises one or more of dates of use information, prioritization level information, and purpose information.

5 46. The article of manufacture of claim 44, wherein the computer-readable code means further comprises, when configuring, a step to mark the network information with a label, which indicates that the network information belongs to a preferred group, when the prioritization privilege indicates that the network information belongs to a preferred group.

10

47. An article of manufacture comprising:
a computer-readable medium having computer-readable code means embodied thereon, the computer-readable code means comprising:

15

determine if an individual belongs to one or more preferred groups;
mark network information associated with the individual with a priority label; and

configure a network to assign a higher priority, as compared to network information not marked with a priority label, to the marked network information.

20 48. The article of manufacture of claim 47, wherein the computer-readable code means further comprises, when marking network information associated with the individual with a priority label, a step to mark network information produced by an application the individual is using with a priority label.

25 49. The article of manufacture of claim 47, wherein the computer-readable code means further comprises, when determining if an individual belongs to one or more preferred groups:

a step to determine if the individual exists in a database that comprises the one or more preferred groups;

30 a step to determine a priority privilege of the individual when the

individual exists in the database; and

a step to determine, when the individual exists in the database, if the priority privilege indicates that network information associated with the individual is to be prioritized.

5

50. The article of manufacture of claim 49, wherein the computer-readable code means further comprises, when determining if an individual exists in a database that comprises the one or more preferred groups:

a step to determine if biometric data entered by the individual matches

10 biometric data for a person in the database; and

a step to determine that the person is the individual and that the individual exists in the database when the biometric data entered by the individual matches biometric data for a person in the database.

EVIDENCE APPENDIX

There is no evidence submitted pursuant to § 1.130, 1.131, or 1.132 or entered by the Examiner and relied upon by appellant.

RELATED PROCEEDINGS APPENDIX

There are no known decisions rendered by a court or the Board in any proceeding identified pursuant to paragraph (c)(1)(ii) of 37 CFR 41.37.